

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1 and 3-8 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, and 4-6 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1 and 3-8 remain pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103**

In item 4 on pages 2-12 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,155,840, issued to Sallette (hereinafter referred to as "Sallette") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,076, issued to Logan et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Logan") and U.S. Patent No. 5,774,662, issued to Sakagawa (hereinafter referred to as "Sakagawa"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites "storing an address table which includes respective terminal addresses of the local side computer terminal and the remote side computer terminals and includes flag information indicating whether each of the terminal addresses is to be notified of the URL information." The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

The Examiner acknowledged that neither Sallette nor Logan disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 identified above. The Examiner went on, however, to state that Sakagawa teaches receiving a terminal address interrogation request from a terminal, referencing an address table and searching for a terminal address corresponding to the protocol address located in the interrogation request, and determining whether the protocol address is contained in the interrogation request agrees with its own protocol address and notifying the server of its own terminal address if agreement is received.

However, the Applicants respectfully submit that, in direct contrast to claim 1, the address table described in Sakagawa apparently contains a correspondence relationship between protocol addresses and terminal addresses associated with an ATM-LAN, but Sakagawa does not describe anything related to the flags (flag values) that indicate whether the terminal addresses are to be respectively notified of the URL information (Column 1, Lines 9-16). In addition, the Applicants respectfully note that step S13 illustrated in Figure 22 is concerned

with returning a terminal address (MAC address), but is not concerned with returning a URL. This is in direct contrast with claim 1 of the present application, which recites an address table which "includes flag information indicating whether each of the terminal addresses is to be notified of the URL information."

Therefore, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least the features of claim 1 described above. In order to form a proper §103 rejection, the cited references must combine to disclose all of the features of the rejected claim. As at least the discussed features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Additionally, claims 3-6 contain similar features to those discussed above in regard to claim 1, and which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-6 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claims 1 and 3, respectively, and include all of the features of those claims plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 8 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

#### Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3 and 4-6 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1 and 3-8 remain pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 09/477,452

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 06/15/06

By: Thomas L. Jones  
Thomas L. Jones  
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501